

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner allowed Claim 10; and issued a final rejection of the other then pending claims – that is, Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-14 – over the prior art. In particular, Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9 and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,230,171 (Pacifici, et al.). Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,411,989 (Anupam, et al.) in view of Pacifici, et al. Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Anupam, et al. in view of Pacifici, et al. and further in view of what was well known in the art.

In order to expedite an issuance of a Patent, Applicants are herein canceling all of the rejected claims.

Applicants wish to expressly note that Applicants do not agree with the rejections of Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-14, and Applicants expressly reserve the right to file a continuation application to continue the prosecution of claims directed to the subject matter of these claims.

This Amendment does not raise any new issues and, moreover, places the entire application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is believed that entry of this Amendment is appropriate, and such entry is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance, a notice of which is requested. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John S. Sensny
John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicants

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza – Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:jy